

COMPLAINT BY A PRISONER UNDER THE CIVIL RIGHTS ACT, 42 U.S.C. §§ 1983

Name Doss, Timmie L.
 (Last) (First) (Initial)

FEB 20 2014

RICHARD W. WIEKING
 CLERK, U.S. DISTRICT COURT
 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

Prisoner Number #AM9281Institutional Address P.O. Box 290066 / Represa, CA. 95671.UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

impr. Timmie L. Doss JR.
 (Enter the full name of plaintiff in this action.)

CV 14 0778

vs.

Case No. _____
 (To be provided by the Clerk of Court)

#1: Loki CUKRAN (RICHMOND OFFICER) ET AL.#2: MIQUEL CHAVEZ (JUVENILE P.O. AGENT) ET AL.#3: CHRISTOPHER MARTIN (COUNSEL)#4: DAVID LIVINGSTON (SHERIFF), #5: SHERIFF OF ET AL.
 (Enter the full name of the defendant(s) in this action)#6: RICHMOND POLICE DEPT.COMPLAINT UNDER THE
CIVIL RIGHTS ACT,
Title 42 U.S.C § 1983

" TRIAL REQUESTED."
 or
 SETTLEMENT.

[All questions on this complaint form must be answered in order for your action to proceed..]

I. Exhaustion of Administrative Remedies.

[Note: You must exhaust your administrative remedies before your claim can go
 forward. The court will dismiss any unexhausted claims.]

A. Place of present confinement C.S.P - SACRAMENTO / P.O. Box 290066 / Represa, CA. 95671

B. Is there a grievance procedure in this institution?

YES ☒ NO () N/A.C. Did you present the facts in your complaint for review through the grievance procedure? N/A.YES () NO ☒

D. If your answer is YES, list the appeal number and the date and result of the
 appeal at each level of review. If you did not pursue a certain level of appeal,
 explain why.

1. Informal appeal _____

N/A

2. First formal level _____

N/A

3. Second formal level _____

4. Third formal level _____

N/A

E. Is the last level to which you appealed the highest level of appeal available to you? N/A -

YES ()

NO (X)

F. If you did not present your claim for review through the grievance procedure, explain why. THIS IS NOT A INSTITUTIONAL CLAIM ITS

A FALSE IMPRISONMENT CLAIM.

II. Parties.

A. Write your name and your present address. Do the same for additional plaintiffs, if any.

CMR. JIMMIE L. DOSS, JR. #AM9281

P.O. BOX 290066

REPRESENTA, CA. 95671.

B. Write the full name of each defendant, his or her official position, and his or her place of employment.

#1):

LOKI CURRAN - (RICHMOND POLICE DEPT)

#2):

MIQUEL CHAVEZ (JUVENILE PROBATION DEPT.)

#3):

CHRISTOPHER MARTIN (COUNSEL) 54 RAILROAD AVE.
PT. RICHMOND, CA.

*4): DAVID LIVINGSTON (SHERIFF) DEPT "CONTRA COSTA COUNTY" ET. AL;

*5): RICHMOND POLICE DEPT. ET. AL;

III. Statement of Claim.

State here as briefly as possible the facts of your case. Be sure to describe how each defendant is involved and to include dates, when possible. Do not give any legal arguments or cite any cases or statutes. If you have more than one claim, each claim should be set forth in a separate numbered paragraph.

PETITIONER (MR. DOSS) ALLEGES LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS, JUVENILE PROBATION OFFICERS, SHERIFFS, DEPT OF CONTRA COSTA COUNTY, CONTRA COSTA COUNTY PROSECUTORS, AS WELL AS THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA ET. AL... HAS STRATEGICALLY, AND/OR METHODICALLY CONSPIRED TO "KIDNAP," AND "FALSE IMPRISON" ME (MR. DOSS) BY WAY OF FRAUD, DECEPTION, MISCONDUCT, ABUSE OF POWER BY STATE OFFICIALS ACTING UNDER THE COLOR OF LAW, AND/OR WILLFUL "COVER" UP'S, TO FURTHER THEIR "ILLEGAL DETENTION," AS WELL AS THE CONDUCT OF ALL THOSE INVOLVED; (AS SHOWN IN THIS COMPLAINT)

PETITIONER FURTHER ASSERTS THAT STATE OFFICIALS HAS

IV. Relief.

Your complaint cannot go forward unless you request specific relief. State briefly exactly what you want the court to do for you. Make no legal arguments; cite no cases or statutes.

PETITIONER (MR. DOSS) REQUEST \$300,000.00 FROM EACH (#1) AND (#2) DEFENDANT, AND \$100,000.00 FROM "RICHMOND POLICE DEPT." AND/OR "COUNTY SHERIFF OFFICE" WHO EMPLOY'S DEFENDANTS OR WHO HELD ME (MR. DOSS) ILLEGALLY... EACH ACT UNDER COLOR OF LAW. \$50,000.00 FROM (C. MARTIN) FOR ABANDONMENT.

COMPLAINT

- 3 -

PAGE # (1) OF (6).
CLAIM ONE (1).

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

SAME

I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct.

Signed this 29TH day of JAN, 20 14

Mr. Jimmie L. Ross, Jr.
(Plaintiff's signature)

Page 2 of (6).
Claim #1.

- 1). - FAILED TO CORRECT, OR ACKNOWLEDGE THE COURSE OF ACTION
- 2). OF THOSE WHOM HAS CONTINUE TO WILLFULLY, AND/OR METHODICALLY
- 3). VIOLATE EMP (MR. DOSS) CIVIL RIGHTS AFFORDED UNDER THE U.S. -
- 4). CONSTITUTION 14TH AMENDMENT SEC ^{*}(1) ONE: DUE-PROCESS AND
- 5). PROTECTION LAWS;
- 6). AS WELL AS: 13TH AMENDMENT SEC ^{*}(2) ONE: INVOLUNTARY SERVITUDE
- 7). LAWS;
- 8). AND/OR: 5TH AMENDMENT RIGHTS (NOT TO BE HELD TO ANSWER
- 9). FOR A CAPITAL OR OTHERWISE INFAMOUS CRIME, UNLESS
- 10). ON A PRESENTMENT OR INDICTMENT OF A GRAND JURY.
- 11).
- 12). WHICH FURTHER RESULTED IN A VIOLATION OF U.S. - CONSTITUTIONAL
- 13). SIXTH AMENDMENT RIGHT TO A (SPEEDY TRIAL) AND RIGHT TO A
- 14). (DEFENSE COUNSEL.)
- 15). SEE FACTS OF CASE BELOW FOR FULL DETAILS
- 16).

FACTS OF CASE

- 17).
- 18).
- 19). PETITIONER (MR. DOSS) ALLEGES OFFICER (LORI CURRAN) OF:
- 20). RICHMOND CALIFORNIA POLICE DEPT CONSPIRED WITH AN "JUVENILE"
- 21). PROBATION OFFICER NAMED: (MIGUEL CHAVEZ) TO PUT OUT A "UNJUST"
- 22). WARRANT WITHOUT "JURISDICTION, AUTHORITY, OR CAUSE,
- 23). RESULTING IN AN ~~ILLEGAL~~ "ILLEGAL HOLD," AND "FALSE IMPRISONMENT"
- 24). AS A FAVOR FOR LAW ENFORCEMENT'S (LORI CURRAN), TO SOLELY ALLOW
- 25).
- 26).

page # (3) of (6).
claim # 1.

- 1). - Richmond Police Dept to hold me (Emr. Doss) beyond the
- 2). 48-hour investigational time required under (Ramey Law)
- 3).
- 4). petitioner (Emr. Doss) alleges officer (Lori Curran) was
- 5). granted a Ramey warrant by Judge:
- 6). of Contra Costa County Superior Court on:
- 7). to simply question (Emr. Doss) on a murder investigation, and
- 8). release him within 48-hours
- 9).
- 10). petitioner alleges officer (Lori Curran) knew I (Emr. Doss)
- 11). was on "adult probation," not juvenile, and thus, contacted a
- 12). juvenile agent (Miguel Chavez) to obtain a "judicial favor" in
- 13). the form of a "false" probation violation warrant
- 14).
- 15). petitioner alleges that the conspiracy is documented on
- 16). police reports by defendant (Lori Curran); as exhibit # (A) report...
- 17). whereas the report states:
- 18). Dec 18, 2009. 1330 hrs.
- 19). while reviewing (Doss) criminal history, I
- 20). determined that he was on active probation
- 21). for a prior robbery conviction.
- 22). in an effort to determine where (Doss)
- 23). might be living, I (L. Curran) telephoned
- 24). probation officer (Miguel Chavez) and outlined
- 25). to him the facts of the case. P.O. (Chavez)
- 26).

page (7) of (6).
claim #1.

- 1) - provided me with two addresses;
- 2) 709 South 41st Street, AND 162.3 GARIAMITA AVE.
- 3) IN RICHMOND.
- 4) Efforts to contact (Doss) at both were
- 5) unsuccessful. THE GARIAMITA STREET ADDRESS WAS
- 6) DETERMINED TO BE VACANT AND BOARDED UP. UPON BEING
- 7) TOLD THIS INFORMATION, P.O. (CHAVEZ) AGREED TO HAVE A
- 8) PROBATION WARRANT FOR (DOSS) PLACED IN CLETS.
- 9)
- 10)
- 11) PETITIONER (MR. DOSS) ALLEGES P.O. (CHAVEZ) "IS" NOT
- 12) AND "WAS" NOT (HIS) AGENT OF PROBATION, AND IN FACT WAS A
- 13) "JUVENILE" PROBATION AGENT, "NOT" ADULT, THUS "LACKED" ANY
- 14) "CAUSE" OR "JURISDICTION" TO ISSUE A WARRANT.
- 15)
- 16) PETITIONER ALLEGES HIS (MR. DOSS) "ADULT" PROBATION AGENT
- 17) OF RECORD WAS (MR. BARBARA LUTZ) WHOM "NEVER" INFORMED
- 18) TO VIOLATED (MR. DOSS) PROBATION, THUS CONCLUDING (MR. DOSS)
- 19) WAS WELL IN CONTACT, AND FOR COMPLIANCE WITH (MR. LUTZ)
- 20) RULES OF CONSTRUCTION. WHOM (MR. DOSS) HAD TO SEE ON A
- 21) REGULAR BASIS, AND KEEP CURRENT ADDRESSES UP DATED.
- 22)
- 23) PETITIONER FURTHER ASSERTS THAT OFFICER (LORI CURRAN)
- 24) UTILIZED JUVENILE PROBATION OFFICER (EMIGUEL CHAVEZ) TO
- 25) PUT OUT AN UNJUST WARRANT WHICH PROVED TO BE ILLEGAL.
- 26)

page [#](5) of (6).
Claim # 1.

- 1). - on COURT RECORDS
- 2). WHEREAS, "NO" REVOKE petition's, HOLDING ORDER'S, or
- 3). HEARING'S WERE FILED OR HEARD BETWEEN JAN 1st THRU -
- 4). JAN 28th 2010.
- 5).
- 6). THUS CONCLUDING, THAT I (MR. DOSS) WAS ILLEGALLY
- 7). "HELD", AND/OR "FALSE IMPRISONED" FOR 28-DAYS WITH OUT A
- 8). CHARGE, OR VALID HOLDING ORDER
- 9).
- 10). SEE: EXHIBIT [#](B.) "motion" of EX-COUNSEL (LAUREN RIETHARDS)
- 11). INVESTIGATION OF RECORD'S RESULTS page (2) LINE [#]17 -
- 12). THRU - [#]28.
- 13).
- 14). SEE: EXHIBIT [#](C.) "LETTER" of (2ND) EX-COUNSEL (CHRISTOPHER MARTIN)
- 15). SHOWING HIS CORRESPONDENCE, AND INVESTIGATION
- 16). RESULTS, AS HE CALLED IT "OUTRAGEOUS GOVERNMENTAL
- 17). MISCONDUCT..."
- 18).
- 19).
- 20). PETITIONER (MR. DOSS) ALLEGES OFFICER (LORI CURRAN) AND/OR
- 21). P.O. (CHAVEZ) BOTH STRATEGICALLY ABUSED THEIR RESPECTIVE positions
- 22). OF POWER TO SIMPLY UTILIZE UNJUST, ILLEGAL PROBATION WARRANT TO
- 23). ARREST AND FALSE IMPRISON (MR. DOSS) WITH OUT A "CHARGE", "VIOLATION", or
- 24). "BAIL" AND "COUNSEL" EVER BEING AFFORDED;
- 25).
- 26).

PAGE #6 of (6).

CLAIM #2.

- 1). - PETITIONER ALLEGES OFFICER (LOKI CURRAN) WAS ISSUED
- 2). A SIMPLE "RAMEY" INVESTIGATIONAL WARRANT TO INTERVIEW ME
- 3). (MR. DOSS) FOR 48 HOURS ONLY, THEN RELEASE...
- 4).
- 5). OFFICER (LOKI CURRAN) THEN WELL AWARE OF (MR. DOSS)
- 6). ADULT PROBATION STATUS, AND INSTEAD OF CONTACTING (MR. DOSS),
- 7). OR, HIS ADULT AGENT (BARBARA LUTZ) TO REQUEST (MR. DOSS) CAME
- 8). AND SPEAK TO THEM, OR TO GET ANY UP DATED ADDRESSES (B. LUTZ)
- 9). MAY HAVE HAD, OPTED TO UTILIZE A "FAVOR" IN THE FORM OF THE
- 10). "JUVENILE PROBATION" OFFICER (MIGUEL CHAVEZ) TO DECEPTIVELY HOLD
- 11). (MR. DOSS) PASS THE 48-HOUR RAMEY REQUIREMENTS TO THE TUNE
- 12). OF 28 DAY WITH "NO" CHARGES, "NO" REVOKE PETITIONS, "NO" COUNSEL,
- 13). "NO" BAIL OR HEARINGS, THUS "NO" HOLDING ORDER...
- 14).
- 15).
- 16). PETITIONER (MR. DOSS) ASSERTS COUNTY JAIL OFFICIALS
- 17). OPERATING UNDER "CONTRA COSTA COUNTY" SHERIFF (DAVID O. LIVINGSTON),
- 18). (ASSISTANT SHERIFF) MATT SCHULER, ET. AL;
- 19). HELD ME (MR. DOSS) IN "ILLEGAL DETENTION" FROM JAN 1ST
- 20). - THRU JAN 28TH, 2010, WHICH RESULTED IN THE PRESENT DETENTION...
- 21).
- 22). PETITIONER ALLEGES THERE WAS "NO" VALID, OR "LEGAL HOLDING ORDER"
- 23). TO HOLD ME (MR. DOSS) IN CONFINEMENT, THUS CONSTITUTING CIVIL RIGHTS
- 24). VIOLATIONS BY WAY OF "FALSE IMPRISONMENT."
- 25).
- 26).

1. Appointed State Attorney (CHRISTOPHER ALAN MARTIN)
2. of RICHMOND CALIFORNIA, - WHOM HAS CONTINUED TO RENDER
3. PROFESSIONALLY DEFICIENT REPRESENTATION, BY WILLFULLY, AND/OR
4. INTENTIONALLY IGNORING, OR REFUSING TO ADEQUATELY ARGUE, OR
5. MOTION THE "SUPERIOR COURT" OF CONTRA COSTA COUNTY FOR ONLY
6. (MR. DASS) RELEASE FROM "ILLEGAL DETENTION,"
- 7.
8. PETITIONER (MR. DASS) FURTHER ALLEGES TO HAVE FILED
9. A "MOTION TO DISMISS" PENAL CODE 995 FOR "ILLEGAL DETENTION"
10. BY "OUTRAGEOUS GOVERNMENTAL MISCONDUCT" UNDER: ROCHIN V.
11. CALIFORNIA (1952), 342 U.S. 165. AND/OR VIOLATION OF: PEOPLE V.
12. POWELL (1967) 67 CAL.2D 32, 59-60; PENAL CODE § 858, § 859, § 847,
13. § 825.
14. ALL OF WHICH WAS FILED BY MR. (MR. DASS) AND/OR EX-COUNSEL
15. MR. DIETHARDS ON JAN 26, 2012.
16. YET THE MOTIONS FILED WERE "NOT" HEARD, OR RULED ON,
17. DUE TO COUNSEL BEING RELIEVED, AND NEW COUNSEL (C. MARTIN)
18. "DEFENDANT" BEING APPOINTED
19. YET, NEW COUNSEL (C. MARTIN) HAS CONTINUED TO EXHIBIT
20. KNOWLEDGE OF THE (ILLEGAL DETENTION) AND/OR (DASS MOTIONS)
21. "FILED," BUT "NOT" LITIGATED AS TO DATE.
22. YET DEFENDANT (C. MARTIN) REFUSE TO CONTINUE THE
23. COMPETENT WORK OF EX-COUNSEL (MR. DIETHARDS);
24. THIS SHOWING, ATTORNEY ABANDONMENT, AND A DIRECT WILLFUL
25. VIOLATION OF STRICKLAND V. WASHINGTON (1984) 466 US 668, 688, 80 L.ED
- 26.

"RIGHT TO ADEQUATE COUNSEL."

page #2 of 2.
claim #2.

1). - 2d 674, 693, 104 S. Ct 2052; ("Right to Competent Counsel;")

2).

3). IN RE MARQUEZ (1992) 504 U.S. 584, 596 3 OK 2d 727.

4). IN RE VARGAS (2000) 83 C.A. 4TH 1125, 1152, 100 C.R. 2d 265.

5). (INADEQUATE INVESTIGATION AND INEFFECTIVE REPRESENTATION;)

6).

7).

8). PETITIONER (MR. DOSS) ALLEGES COUNSEL (CHRISTOPHER MARTIN)

9). HAS CONTINUED "NOT" TO "INVESTIGATE" AND/OR ADJUDICATE THE "FALSE

10). IMPRISONMENT" AND "SPEEDY TRIAL VIOLATION" EX-COUNSEL FILED

11). BUT DID "NOT" LITIGATE THE ISSUES DUE TO EX-COUNSEL BEING REMOVED

12). FROM THE CASE BEFORE THE MOTION WAS HEARD.

13).

14). NOW, NEW COUNSEL (CHRISTOPHER MARTIN) REFUSE TO DO

15). ANY WORK ON THIS CASE; RESULTING IN A "SIX," AND "FOURTEEN" AMENDMENT

16). VIOLATIONS OF (MR. DOSS) U.S. - CONSTITUTIONAL MANDATE.

17).

18).

19).

20).

21).

22).

23).

24).

25).

26).